

I wish to comment on the provisions of the bylaw as they relate to parking policy for medium and high density residential uses.

Before approving the Bylaw, further review by the City of the proposed provisions is warranted that is actually based on "ground-truthing" or the "real world" as it exists around such newer developments. One case in point is development along the Gordon Street intensification corridor.

It is abundantly clear that the *current* City policies to date have *failed* to provide for sufficient parking for such developments as 1291 Gordon (Solstice 1) or 60 Arkell, to name only two examples. This can be seen by the fact that a minimum of 8 cars can be seen at any time on the Guelph Bible Chapel lot on Arkell, and often many more than that. Staff at the Salvation Army Church on Gordon give testament that parents and other visitors will walk in on Friday evenings and Saturdays waving \$50 bills, offering to pay for parking on the Church lot for the weekend as there is no other parking to be found. Bylaw is called regularly for illegally parked cars on Vaughan, Ridgeway and other streets due to lack of parking on nearby higher density developments. Commercial tenants on Gordon face frustration and higher security costs from their customer parking being taken up from higher density developments.

It is clear that existing parking policy for high and medium density residential is uninformed and heedless of costs and inconvenience inflicted on other residences and businesses.

Out of town visitors and parents who cannot find parking near the Gordon intensification corridor are left with the impression that the City is at best, guilty of blithe wishful thinking about modality shares, and at worst, that it is simply not competent or uncaring in setting policy on these matters . And / or, that it is in the thrall of the development community who constantly lobby for less parking and more units. Additionally, nearby residents find the lack of parking and the spillover onto their streets to be "irksome", putting it mildly. And they well know it is the City and Councillors who are accountable for the issue.

As a taxpayer, I am concerned that Bylaw officers are being kept unnecessarily tasked with sort parking issues that should have been sorted out properly at the time of development approvals and ZB policy approvals.

Given the housing affordability issue, more workforce participation is occurring. Generally, that means more household vehicles to reach employment.

Please take the time for further review by staff and Council. Get out there and talk to local residents, to commercial tenants, to churches. Most members of the public do not equate "zoning" and land use planning with the mundane issue of parking capacities and policies. Recognizing this general unawareness of the significance of the proposed Bylaw as it relates to parking should by itself motivate to City to pause the Bylaw until such a review is completed.

Bill Mungall